UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,348	04/14/2000	Anand Rangarajan	P3919	8679

24739   7590   04/18/2005

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY
PO BOX 187
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 January 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 01/13/2005.

2.   Claims 1-17 and 19 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are

independent claims. Claim 18 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1-6, 15-16, and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Light et al. (hereinafter Light, US Patent Number 6,192,380, filed on

March 31, 1998) in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent Number 6,199,079, filed March 20,

1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Light discloses a method in which a form

recognition unit detects properties about a form and a website containing a form

(column 2, line 63-column 3, line 47 of Light). A matching unit then decides what data

should be place in the form and at what locations, at which point the data and

instructions on what to do with it (job order) is sent to the fill-in unit (column 3, line 48-

column 4, line 30 of Light). The job order is an instruction that is executable by the fill-in

unit and the instruction includes data necessary to navigate to and register (fill-in the

form) to a site, which could include information such as an authentication password

(column 3, line 30-column 4, line 30). The fill-in unit then submits the data into the form

and ultimately submits the form to the host (column 3, line 48-column 4, line 30 of

Light). Then, any new form information necessary for the site is added to the database

containing a user's form data (column 4, lines 5-36 of Light). Light does not disclose a

method in which user notification is returned to the user that includes the result of the

form submission and registration attempt, including registration status and

authentication data.

However, Gupta discloses a method in which a user notification is returned from

the hosted site, which includes the results of the form submission and registration,

status and authentication data (column 6, line 56-column 8, line 13 of Gupta). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to have combined the method of Light with the method of Gupta because it would have

allowed the user to track transactions made with all sites.

Regarding dependent claims 2-4, Light discloses a method in which forms are

found on web pages on the Web (Internet) (column 1, lines 7-40 of Light).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Light discloses a method in which forms are

filled out with information such as credit card numbers to pay for a service (Figure 6 and

column 3, lines 5-59 of Light).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Light discloses a method in which the form-filling

process is completely controlled by a single networked system (server) (Figure 3 and

column 2, line 53-column 3, line 47 of Light).

Regarding independent claim 15, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 16, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claims 2-4. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claims 2-4.

Regarding independent claim 19, Light discloses a method in which a form recognition unit detects properties about a form and a website containing a form (column 2, line 63-column 3, line 47 of Light). A matching unit then decides what data should be place in the form and at what locations, at which point the data and instructions on what to do with it (job order) is sent to the fill-in unit (column 3, line 48-column 4, line 30 of Light). The job order is an instruction that is executable by the fill-in unit and the instruction includes data necessary to navigate to and register (fill-in the form) to a site, which could include information such as an authentication password (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 30). The fill-in unit then submits the data into the form and ultimately submits the form to the host (column 3, line 48-column 4, line 30 of Light). Then, any new form information necessary for the site is added to the database containing a user's form data (column 4, lines 5-36 of Light). Light discloses a method in which the system stores new form information obtained from a site once the form filling process is complete (column 4, lines 5-36 of Light). Light does not disclose a method in which user notification is returned to the user that includes the result of the

form submission and registration attempt, including registration status and

authentication data.

However, Gupta discloses a method in which a user notification is returned from

the hosted site, which includes the results of the form submission and registration,

status and authentication data (column 6, line 56-column 8, line 13 of Gupta). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to have combined the method of Light with the method of Gupta because it would have

allowed the user to track transactions made with all sites.

5.   Claim 7, 9-12, and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Light et al. (hereinafter Light, US Patent Number 6,192,380, filed

March 31, 1998) in view of Gupta et al. (hereinafter Gupta, US Patent Number

6,199,079, filed March 20, 1998) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view

of Jacobs et al. (US Patent Number 5,611,048, issued on March 11, 1997).

Regarding dependent claim 7, neither Light nor Gupta disclose a method of

distributing software functions over a plurality of server nodes. However, Jacobs et al.

discloses that functions to be performed on a server can be divided across multiple

servers (column 4, lines 9-17 of Jacobs et al.). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the

methods of Light and Gupta with the method of Jacobs et al. because it would have

optimized the efficiency of the method of Light by splitting the workloads among multiple

servers.

Regarding independent claim 9, Light discloses a method in which a form
recognition unit detects properties about a form and a website containing a form
(column 2, line 63-column 3, line 47 of Light). A matching unit then decides what data
should be place in the form and at what locations, at which point the data and
instructions on what to do with it (job order) is sent to the fill-in unit (column 3, line 48-
column 4, line 30 of Light). The job order is an instruction that is executable by the fill-in
unit and the instruction includes data necessary to navigate to and register (fill-in the
form) to a site, which could include information such as an authentication password
(column 3, line 30-column 4, line 30). The fill-in unit then submits the data into the form
and ultimately submits the form to the host (column 3, line 48-column 4, line 30 of
Light). Then, any new form information necessary for the site is added to the database
containing a user's form data (column 4, lines 5-36 of Light). Light does not disclose a
method in which user notification is returned to the user that includes the result of the
form submission and registration attempt, including registration status and
authentication data.

However, Gupta discloses a method in which a user notification is returned from
the hosted site, which includes the results of the form submission and registration,
status and authentication data (column 6, line 56-column 8, line 13 of Gupta). It would
have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made
to have combined the method of Light with the method of Gupta because it would have
allowed the user to track transactions made with all sites. Neither Light nor Gupta
disclose a method of performing the functions using a server for each function.

However, Jacobs et al. discloses that functions to be performed on a server can

be divided across multiple servers (column 4, lines 9-17 of Jacobs et al.). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have combined the methods of Light and Gupta with the method of Jacobs et al.

because it would have optimized the efficiency of the method of Light by splitting the

workloads among multiple servers.

Regarding dependent claims 10-12, the claims incorporate similar subject

matter as claims 2-4. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims

2-4.

Regarding dependent claim 14, neither Light nor Gupta disclose a method of

distributing software functions over a plurality of server nodes, which are connected to

each other via a dedicated data network. However, Jacobs et al. discloses that

functions to be performed on a server can be divided across multiple servers that are

connected to each other via a local area network (column 4, lines 9-17 of Jacobs et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the methods of Light and Gupta with the method of Jacobs

et al. because it would have optimized the efficiency of the method of Light by splitting

the workloads among multiple servers.

6.   Claims 8, 13, and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Light et al. (hereinafter Light, US Patent Number 6,192,380, filed

March 31, 1998) in view of Gupta et al. (hereinafter Gupta, US Patent Number

6,199,079, filed March 20, 1998) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, and 15 above, and further in view of Kraft et al. (US Patent Number 6,084,585, with US filing date of December 5, 1997).

Regarding dependent claims 8, 13, and 17, neither Light nor Gupta disclose a method in which the job order is written in XML. However, Kraft et al. discloses that executable instructions which can be thought of as job orders can be written in any programming language including XML (column 3, lines 35-40 of Kraft et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Light and Gupta with the method of Kraft et al. because the use of different programming languages was interchangeable.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 01/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the arguments on pages 8-9, regarding independent claim 1 and the limitation "...a function for navigating to the site..." the examiner feels that the previous and current rejection and the Light reference disclose this limitation. Light teaches that a program has the ability to navigate to a website (column 1, lines 43-37 and column 2, lines 53-62, of Light). Light discusses this program (browser) to be one possible embodiment of the method and system disclosures shown in the previous and current rejection.

Regarding the arguments on pages 9-11, regarding independent claim 1 and the limitation "...a function for user notification of data that is the result of the form submission and registration attempt..." the examiner feels that the previous and current rejection and the Gupta reference disclose this limitation. Gupta discloses a method in which one transaction can occur that handles multiple on-line vendors, the system then stores the confirmation from the transaction, thus multiple vendors as a whole, which a notification to the user that the shipments have been purchased and may be tracked (column 6, line 56-column 8, line 13 of Gupta), which is shown to be a necessity by the description of the problems to be remedied (column 2, lines 39-64 of Gupta), thus verifying the motivation asserted by the examiner based on the Gupta reference. It was for this reason that the examiner did not simply cite the section on notification (column 7, line 66-column 8, line 12 of Gupta) because taken out of context of the multiple vendor functionality of the system disclosed by Gupta the notification capability could be misunderstood.

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
April 7, 2005

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100